

confuted, yet betwixt the latter and that, *dg* we find a wonderful correspondence; which is largely pursued in the Platonic Christian apology. Wherein, notwithstanding, nothing must be looked upon, as dogmatically asserted by us, but only offered, and submitted to the judgment of the learned in these matters; we confining ourselves in this mysterious point of the holy trinity, within the compass of those its three essentials declared :—First, that it is not a trinity of mere names and w^Tords, or of logical notions only; but of persons or hypostases.—Secondly, that none of those persons or hypostases are creatures, but all uncreated.—And, lastly, that they are all three, truly and really one God. Nevertheless we acknowledge, that we did therefore the more copiously insist upon this argument, because of our then designed defence of Christianity; we conceiving, that this parallelism, betwixt the ancient or genuine Platonic, and the Christian trinity, might be of some use to satisfy those amongst us, who boggle so much at the trinity, and look upon it as the choak-pear of Christianity; when they shall find, that the freest wife amongst the Pagans, and the best philosophers, who had nothing of superstition to determine them that way, were so far from being shy of such, an hypothesis, as that they were even fond thereof. And that the Pagans had indeed such a Cabala amongst them (which same perhaps will yet hardly believe, notwithstanding all that we have said), might be further convinced, from that memorable relation in Plutarch/ of Thespesius Solensis, who,

* Libro de his, qui sero & Numme puniuntur, tern, ii.
Opcr. p. 563. & -